1	Christopher D. Banys (State Bar No. 230038) Richard C. Lin (State Bar No. 209233)	
2	Jennifer L. Gilbert (State Bar No. 255820) Eric J. Sidebotham (State Bar No. 208829)	JEFFREY G. HOMRIG (Bar No. 215890)
3	cdb@banyspc.com rcl@banyspc.com	EUGENE CHIU (pro hac vice) eugene.chiu@lw.com
4	jlg@banyspc.com ejs@banyspc.com	LINFONG TZENG (Bar No. 281798)
5	BANYS, P.C. 1032 Elwell Court, Suite 100	linfong.tzeng@lw.com LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
6	Palo Alto, California 94303 Telephone: (650) 308-8505	140 Scott Drive Menlo Park, California 94025
7	Facsimile: (650) 353-2202	Telephone: +1.650.328.4600 Facsimile: +1.650.463.2600
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff BENJAMIN GROBLER	JOSEPH. H. LEE (Bar No. 248046)
9		joseph.lee@lw.com LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
10		650 Town Center Drive, 20th Floor Costa Mesa, California 92626
11		Telephone: +1.714.540.1235 Facsimile: +1.714.755.8290
12		KATHY YU (Bar No 268210) kathy.yu@lw.com
13		LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 355 South Grand Avenue
14		Los Angeles, California 90071
15		Telephone: +1.213.485.1234 Facsimile: +1.213.891.8763
16		Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.
17		
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
19	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
20	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
21	BENJAMIN GROBLER	Case No. 3:12-cv-01534-JST (JSC)
22	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
23	v.	JOINT MOTION TO STAY
24	APPLE INC.,	
25	Defendant.	
26		
27		
28		

Before the Court is the Joint Motion To Stay filed by Plaintiff Benjamin Grobler ("Grobler") and Defendant Apple Inc. ("Apple"). Having considered the motion, and for good cause shown, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

The parties' Joint Motion to Stay is GRANTED.

The case is stayed through and until June 4, 2014 and will continue with the following schedule:

Event	Schedule
Reopen discovery	6/4/14
Fact discovery cut-off	7/3/14
Opening expert	7/17/14
Rebuttal expert	7/31/14
Expert discovery cut-off	8/13/14
Deadline for filing dispositive motions	10/6/14
Pretrial conference statement	12/30/14
Pretrial conference	1/9/15
Trial	1/26/15

This stay does not permit the parties to serve additional written discovery requests on the other party should discovery resume. Moreover, should discovery resume, the change in schedule will not be cited as a factor in the merits of any discovery motion brought by the parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 6, 2014

rable Jon S. Tigar led States District Judge